



04.26.04

EV207493932US

6p2859

## THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventor Application of: ) Group Art Unit: 2859  
)  
REISKER et al. )  
)  
Filed: February 5, 2002 ) Examiner: SHRIVASTAV, Brij B.  
)  
Serial No.: 10/068,300 )  
)  
Confirmation No. 9757 ) Docket No.: MR/98-003.C  
)  
For: COIL STRUCTURE WITH TAPERED )  
MEMBERS FOR IMPROVED )  
HOMOGENEITY IN MRI ) Date: April 23, 2004

MAIL STOP NON-FEE AMENDMENT  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE AND AMENDMENT

Sir:

Applicants acknowledge that they have received an Office Action dated December 23, 2003, concerning the application for patent cited above. According to the Office Action, the application is deficient in the following respects:

(1) Claims 46-60, 62-76 and 77-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention;

(2) Claims 62-65, 67, 70 and 72-76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the teachings disclosed in U.S. Patent 5,602,479 to Srinivasan et al;

(3) Claims 32-33, 35-36, 77-78 and 80-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the teachings disclosed in U.S. Patent 6,100,691 to Yeung; and

(4) Claims 18-21, 25, 27-31, 46-49, 51-54 and 56-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the

*Response And Amendment*

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/068,300

Attorney Docket No. MR/98-003.C

Page 2 of 25

*Srinivasan et al.* patent, and further in view of *Adriany et al.*,  
PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR MAGNETIC RESONANCE IN MEDICINE (ISMRM),  
p. 177, April 12-18, 1997.

The Examiner noted, however, that claims 22-24, 26, and 34  
(against which objections have been made) would be allowable if  
rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any  
intervening claims.

In response, Applicants herein amend the independent claims to  
include the limitations heretofore contained within the objected-to  
claims, such as claim 22. These amendments, Applicants believe, now  
make the claims allowable over the prior art of record. Consistent  
with the foregoing, Applicants have also canceled claims 22, 50 and  
66. Various other dependent claims have also been amended to  
accommodate the changes to the independent claims.

*A Petition For One-Month Extension Of Time* accompanies this  
*Response and Amendment.*